Marked-up Amended Claims:

1. (Twice Amended) A method for generating a dump file, the method comprising:

a. generating a dump file that does not include all operating system data by gathering at least:

i. thread information for at least one running thread,

ii. context information for the thread,

iii. callstack information for the thread,

iv. process information for a process in which the thread is running, and

v. information identifying a reason for generating the dump file; and

b. storing the dump file to a storage medium.

20. (Twice Amended) A computer-readable medium having computer-executable instructions for causing at least one processor to perform acts comprising:

gathering dump file information that does not include all operating system data but does include [including] at least thread information for at least one running thread, context information for the thread, callstack information for the thread, process information for the process in which the thread is running, and information identifying a reason for generating the dump file; and generating a dump file using the dump file information.

39. (Twice Amended) An apparatus comprising;

memory;

a data storage drive configured to write data files to at least one data storage medium; and

at least one processor operatively coupled to the memory and the data storage drive and configured to:

a. generate a dump file that does not include all operating system data by gathering in the memory at least:

i. thread information for at least one running thread,

ii. context information for the thread,

iii. callstack information for the thread,

iv. process information for the process in which the thread is running, and

v. information identifying a reason for generating the dump file; and

b. store the dump file to the storage medium.

REMARKS

Claims 1, 20 and 39 have been amended to further clarify that which is being claimed.

Claims 76 and 77, which the Examiner previously withdrew as being directed towards a non-elected invention, have been canceled without prejudice to expedite allowance of the remaining pending claims.

Claims 1-57 and 67-75 are pending.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a):

Claims 1-12, 14-31, 32-50, 52-57 and 67-75 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,430,707 issued to *Matthews et al.*

The Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections for at least the following reasons.

Matthews et al. disclose a system wherein a dump image is transferred from a client device to a server device over a network when the client device fails. The dump image that is transmitted to the server device includes the contents of memory, including the operating system, the code, the stack, threads, registers, and local and global variables that can be analyzed at a source level. See, e.g., column 2, lines 27-34. This is a classical system dump, which is large and cumbersome and time-consuming to transfer and analyze. Indeed, *Matthews et al.* distinctly point out that the resulting image can be processed by a standard debugging tool such as ICAT. That is because the resulting image is a classical system dump.

What *Matthews et al.* do present is one way to perform such a system dump in a client device that doesn't have the ability to store the large resulting dump image locally. Thus, *Matthews at al.* teach that the dump image can be transferred to the server by using a separately running process and packet-based communication capability.

To the contrary the pending claims are directed towards dump files that are not classical system dumps, which, for example, (and expressly recited/stated) do not include all of the operating system data.

Furthermore, the novel dump file that is generated includes information identifying a reason for generating the dump file. It should be noted that the Office Action failed to adequately address this recited claim limitation. One reason is that *Matthews et al.* do not disclose or otherwise even suggest that such identifying information be included in the dump image. Instead, Matthews et al. list various exemplary failures that might lead to their dump image being created, but no identifying reason is itself included in their dump image.

Hence, *Matthews et al.* neither disclose nor reasonably suggest such a novel dump file and do not include information identifying a reason for generating their dump image in their dump image itself, for example, as recited in independent **Claims 1, 20 or 39**.

For at least these reasons Claims 1, 20 and 39 are clearly patentable over *Matthews et al.*, as are applicable dependent **Claims 2-12, 14-19, 21-31, 32-38, 40-50, 52-57 and 67-75**.

It is respectfully requested that the rejections be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a):

Claims 13, 32 and 51 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Matthews et al.* in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,603,033 issued to *Joannin.*

The Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections for at least the reasons stated above and also the following reasons.

Joannnin discloses a tool for debugging an operating system. Here, *Joannin* employs at typical process for analyzing a post-mortem dump file by restoring the dump file data to memory and processing it accordingly. This is a fairly conventional process.

One of the limitations in Claims 13, 32 and 51, that *Matthews et al.* and/or *Joannin* fail to disclose and/or reasonably suggest is the minidump file that is substantially and patentably different than conventional system dump images/files. Note, as described above, the resulting minidump file is produced from the dump file recited in the independent claims, which expressly does not include all operating system data as do conventional system dumps. Hence, the name "minidump".

Thus, *Matthews et al.* and/or *Joannin* do not disclose nor reasonably suggest, either alone or in combination, such a novel minidump file, especially one that includes information identifying a reason for generating the minidump file but not all operating system data, as recited in independent **Claims 13, 32 and/or 51**.

For at least these reasons Claims 13, 32 and 51 are clearly patentable over *Matthews et al.* and *Joannin.*

It is respectfully requested that the rejections be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Conclusion

The pending claims are patentable over the recited art. It is respectfully requested that the claims be allowed and a patent promptly issued.

Respectfully Submitted,

Dated: 4/14/03

By: _____

Thomas A. Jolly
Reg. No. 39,241
(509) 324-9256